

The
ABROGATION (4)
OF
The Jewvish Sabbath,
OR
Sabbath of the 7th day of the week.

Together,
With some brief Observations upon
two small Treatises :

1. *The unchangeable Morality of the
7th day Sabbath. Written by J. S.*
2. *The Morality of the fourth Com-
mandment.*

In prosecution whereof, sundry Scri-
ptures are opened and cleared.

By *William Aspinwall.*

Prov. 18. 7. *He that is first in his own cause, seemeth just ;
but his neighbor cometh, and searcheth him.*

Printed at London, by J. C. for Liewel Chapman,
at the Crown in Popes-head-Alley. 1657.

The
 ABRIGATION
 OF
 The Jewish Sabbath
 OR

Sabbath of the 7th day of the week.

Together,

With some brief Observations upon
 two small Treatises:

1. The unchangeable Morality of the
 7th day Sabbath. Written by J. S.
2. The Morality of the fourth Com-



In prosecution whereof, sundry scri-
 ptures are opened and cleared.

By William A. Pinnock.

Printed at the Crown in Strand, and at the
 Press of J. S. in Pall-mall, 1717.

When Truth is decried, and Error is advanced in its place, it be-
hoveth the Children of Wisdom to justify the one, and bear witness
against the other. Had not this been the case at this day, this
little Treatise had not seen the light. Yea, when I considered how difficult it
would be to reprove an Error (taken up by men otherwise Godly) without
grieving the Spirits of some that are more tenderly consciencious, or strengthen-
ing the hands of the sons of Violence against them, I was almost discouraged
from publishing thereof: and for some good season the publication hath been de-
ferred. Till at length, being excited by some precious Saints, to divulge the
same for the good of others, and of them more especially that have been mis-
led, or may yet be unsettled in this Point; I resolved to send it abroad in that
plain and homely dress as first it was prepared: avoiding, with all care and di-
ligence, any expressions that might grieve or offend such Brethren as have been
drawn aside in this particular, so far as it may stand with a faithful and im-
partial witness-bearing to the Truth. Which being a task very difficult, and
such as needs a great measure of the Spirit of Wisdom and Love; to conduct in
the handling thereof, I judge it necessary for me, in sense of mine own weakness
and insufficiency, to look up to him who giveth liberally, and upbraideth not: and
therefore desire our dissenting Brethren, if possibly they may meet with any thing
that may seem to have any other appearance, they would candidly interpret my
words, and know my intention is not to grieve or wound; but to cure and heal
any that are gone astray: and accordingly, with a Spirit of Love to read and
receive, what is here tendered to them in Love.

It is far from my purpose, to stir up or strengthen the hands of men in power
to smite with the fist of wickedness such as dissent in judgement (and it may be
in practise too) from themselves, and others also that are Godly, in this point. I
rather judge it a duty, to bear witness against such a persecuting and Anti-
christian Practise, as utterly repugnant to Gospel-principles. Goals and Prisons
have been the usual arguments, wherewith the adversaries of the truth, have
been wont to dispute against Saints. So doth not Christ. When he comes to deal
with the world for sin, he sends them not to Goals and Prisons: but sends his
Spirit to convince them of their Errors. And in this very case of the Sabbath,
when some Brethren did (in a time of great straits and necessity) take bold-
ness to violate the day of rest: what did good Nehemiah, Neh. 13. 15. in this
case? Did he exercise power as the Tirshatha or chief Governor, to commit them
to Goals and Prisons? verily, No. He rather, like his Lord and Master
Christ, reasons the matter with them, and rebukes their transgression, shewing
them the danger thereof, and what wrath it would bring upon Israel. And
when that did not prevail, but they still persisted to bring their wares, and lodged
once

once and again without the gates, (which he for prevention had caused to be kept shut) yet he sell not soul upon them forthwith, but testifieth against them, and debates the matter with them, before he did so much as threaten to put forth an Act of Power. Indeed, after due means used to convince their consciences, he declares, That if they will still persist in such an open breach of the Rest, after so many admonitions and means of conviction used; he then would exercise Power to curb that open breach of the Command, which a Magistrate, as an Heir of restraint, may do. He may command the gates of the City to be shut, as Nehemiah did, to prevent the carrying in or out of Goods upon that day. He may (pro tempore, during the day of Rest) seize such Goods as are brought for sale, to prevent the profanation of the day of Rest. And by the same proportion, he may cause any shops to be shut up, as shall be set open upon that day of Rest; or restrain such persons as would wilfully (after divers admonitions and due means of conviction used) do servile works upon that day. This, as an Heir of restraint, he may do: But to exercise Acts of Power upon the outward man, until due means have been used to inform and convince conscience: yea, after all that hath been done, to throw men into Prisons, and there to detain them from their Families & from their lawful Callings, upon the other days appointed for labor; and by such means to maintain a company of ungodly Taylors, out of other mens Estates, is a most unchristian, I may justly call it, Antichristian practice, and worthy to be born witness against, as a Lording it, not only over the Bodies and Estates of their Brethren; but over their Consciences also. And let such as are in place of Power, beware how they meddle with any of Christ's little Flock, and see they deal with them as Christ himself would do in the like case, and as themselves should do, if they would be reputed the Servants of Christ, and Rulers for him: Otherwise, let them be assured, Christ will render such little Ones, how weak soever they be, and rebuke those that do them wrong. And better were it for such Rulers, that a millstone were hanged about their necks, and that they were cast into the Sea; then that they should offend any one of Christ's little ones. On the other side, let me persuade such Brethren, that they offend not the Lord and their fellow-Brethren, by vilifying and violating the Lord's day, calling it the whores Sabbath; or by doing their own works thereon, lest they suffer as evil doers. For though Conscience may be some excuse for their observance of the seventh day, till God come in with further Light; yet Conscience can be no excuse for them, to blaspheme or violate that day of Rest, which their Brethren count the Lord's day; and in obedience to the Command, do observe as a day of holy Rest: yea, those of their own judgement, do acknowledge that the whole stream of the godly, are for the observance of our Lord's day. I shall therefore shut up this Preface with a word of advice (both to Rulers, and to our dissenting Brethren) in the words of the Apostle, Let your moderation appear to all men: the Lord is at hand.

The

The SEVENTH-DAY-SABBATH abrogated.

COL. 2. 16, 17.

16. *Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast, or of the new moons, or of the sabbaths :*

17. *Which are a shadow of things to come, but the body [is] of Christ.*

THe scope of the Apostle (as in other Epistles to other Churches, so) in this, is to strengthen the Gentile-Christians, against the flie insinuations of Jewish Teachers ; whose endeavour was to bring the Gentile Christians unto the Jewish Pedagogy. Now to preserve them from being seduced, he sweetly insinuates unto them the perfection that is in Christ, and in all his Institutions. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are compleat in him ; and therefore no need you should be carried back to *Moses*, vers. 9, 10. Moreover, he sheweth the excellency of Gospel-institutions above the institutions of *Moses*, in regard of the spiritual nature of them ; and instanceth in Circumcision and Baptism ; comparing them together, vers. 11, 12, 13. Thirdly, he dissuadeth them from *Mosaical* Ceremonies and shadows, and proveth the abrogation and nullity of them all, by this one instance of days of worship, enumerating all the days of instituted worship amongst the Jews. From whence it will follow, That if the times of legal worship be abrogated, then the worship it self also, and all appendixes thereof. Now that the days or times of publick instituted worship are abolished, the Apostle proveth by

the nature of them. *They are all but one shadow of things to come,* vers. 17. And all men know; yea, Reason it self may dictate so much to us, That when the substance is come, the shadow must needs vanish. For shadows are of things to come, as the Apostle reasoneth, and not of things past or present. I shall briefly come therefore to the words of the Text, from whence we may argue thus:

All shadows of things to come, that represent somewhat of the body of Christ, when Christ the body (or substance) is come, do vanish, and are to be abolished.

But Feasts, new Moons and Sabbaths, even all the days of Jewish publick instituted worship, are shadows, or all together make up one entire shadow of Christ, the body or substance:

And therefore, Christ being come, they do all vanish, and are abolished.

The *major* is evident. For when the substance of those shadows, to wit, the body of Christ is come, and hath fulfilled the thing signified by them, then there is no need of a shadow; because shadows are of things to come, as the Apostle reasoneth in the Text, and not of things present or past. And so Mr. *Spittlehouse* in that Treatise of the seventh-day-Sabbaths Morality, doth acknowledge, pag. 19. Wherefore the retaining of the shadow doth proclaim, that the substance, to wit, the body of Christ is not yet come.

The *minor* is proved by the Apostle in the Text, by an induction of particulars, or a particular enumeration of all the kinds of holy Assemblies for publick worship instituted to the Jews; namely, Feasts, New Moons and Sabbaths, which were all the days that Christ (by *Moses*) appointed for publick worship, as appears *Ezek. 45. 17.* *And it shall be the princes part [to give] burnt-offerings, and meat-offerings, and drink-offerings, in the feasts, and in the new Moons, and in the sabbaths, even in all their solemn assemblies.* And lest any should think, that by Sabbaths, in the Plural Number, is not meant the Sabbaths or Rest upon the seventh-day of the week, (as the Author of that Treatise above mentioned would perswade men to believe) let him read *Hos. 2. 11.* where the Prophet maketh the very same distribution of days appointed for publick worship; saying, *I will also cause her mirth to cease, her feast day her new moon, and her sabbath: even every holy assembly of hers:* speaking in the singular Number, to shew, that every of her Sabbaths, even the seventh-day-Sabbath as well as any other Sab-

Sabbath (for *That*, by way of excellency, is called *the Sabbath*) shall cease, as to the publick outward observance of the same, during the time of the Captivity. And from both Scriptures it is evident, that all their days of publick worship were ranked into these three sorts, namely, Feasts, New Moons and Sabbaths, even as the Apostle here reckons them up in the Text; saying of them all, *they are a shadow of things to come, the body (or substance) being Christ.*

The word *σκιά*, as Mr. Leigh (out of *Piscator*) observes, doth *Crit. Sacri* signifie, *Adumbrationem, seu rudem delineationem, qualem carbone facere solent Pictores, imaginem aliquem picturi*: A dark shadow, or rude draught, such as Painters are wont to make when they are about to draw a figure.

Quest. Now it may be asked, What did all these days of publick worship shadow forth, touching the body of Christ to come? they being (as the Apostle saith) but one entire shadow of the body of Christ.

Answ. For answer hereunto, I shall a little unfold the words of the Text; and the rather, because the Author of that Treatise hath omitted it. The Relative (*αἱ*) which is of the plural number, and comprehendeth Feasts, new Moons and Sabbaths, even all of them; which being put together, do make up but one shadow or rude draught of things to come. Now what are those things to come? or, what is the substance of those shadows? To this the Apostle answereth in the last words of that Verse, *The body of Christ, or his humane nature.* For so I take those words as an answer, to satisfy such as might enquire what the Apostle meant, by a shadow of things to come.

Quest. Yet still it will be said, What particulars touching the body of Christ, did those Ceremonial days adumbrate or shadow forth?

Answ. This being the main Query, and most necessary to lead us to a right understanding of the Apostles scope in this Text, I shall endeavour, in answer hereunto, to shew you what particulars all these Feasts, new Moons and Sabbaths did shadow concerning the body or humane nature of Christ, speaking to every of them in their due order. And first I shall begin with the Feasts, which were in number three; namely, *Tabernacles, Passover, Pentecost*: all of which, as touching the time and other circumstances, did shadow forth something of the body of Christ.

How the
Feast of Ta-
bernacles
was a sha-
dow.

The Feast of Tabernacles, which was to begin upon the 15th day of the 7th Month, *Lev. 23.34.* and to be observed eight days, did shadow forth two things touching the body or humane nature of Christ. The first day of this Feast, did shadow forth the very time and day of the Month, wherein Jesus Christ the Messiah should be born into the world, as we may perceive by the Apostles allusion to that Feast, *John 1.14. The word was made flesh, and tabernacled amongst us.* He was made flesh at his conception, and at his birth he tabernacled amongst us. And that this was really accomplished in the birth of Jesus, the Son of *Mary* (at that very Feast) was so known unto the very Jews of that Age, that none of them then living, nor any since, durst deny the Truth of it. And as the first day did shadow forth his birth, so the eighth day did shadow out the Circumcision of Christ, as to be upon that very day, according to the Law. Both these days are called *Sabbathon*, a Sabbathism or Rest, or as our Translation renders it, a *Sabbath*, *Lev. 23.39.* Thus you see briefly what this Feast did shadow or prefigure touching the *Messiah* to come: for such was the wisdom of God to lead his ancient People by such kinde of Rudiments unto a cleer discerning of the promised Seed: so that when they should see such a Son as this, born of the Line of *David*, and conceived in an extraordinary manner by the Virgin, and that upon the first day of the week, and also at the new Moon: born also upon the feast-day of Tabernacles, and circumcised upon the last day of the same; suffering death upon the true day of Pascheover; and lying in the Grave upon the SABBATH-day; and last of all, pouring out the Spirit in Gifts of Tongues, upon the day of *Pentecost*, they might be convinced that he was indeed the *Messiah* promised; and of whom all these Ceremonies were but shadows: for all these things concurring in one person, (as they did in Jesus the Son of *Mary* the Virgin) were a demonstrative proof of the *Messiah*, and might have convinced the Jews of that Age, had not their hearts been hardened, and their eyes blinded through the righteous Judgement of God.

Secondly, The Feast of *Pascheover*, which was celebrated upon the 15th day of the Month *Nisan*, was not only a commemoration of the Angels passing over the Israelites, when he slew the first-born in *Egypt*, (which also had a shadow in it) but the Apostle saith, *it is, or was a shadow of the body of Christ*, to wit, his death, and offering up upon the Cross upon that very day: for though the Apostle,

posse, speaking of the day whereon Christ suffered, *John 19.14.* calleth it the day of the preparation of the Paschever, or the day going before the Paschever, (as indeed it was) in regard of the superstitious translation of days observed amongst the Jews of that Age, (See *Munsters Heb. Calend.* pag. 127. and also in his *Epist. Nuncupat.*) yet without controversie, our Lord Jesus kept his own Law exactly, which required that the Lamb should be slain upon the 14th day of *Nisan*, in the Afternoon; and to be eaten at even following, which was indeed the 15th day of the Month, and upon the very same day he was sacrificed for us, being offered up upon the Cross: so that the superstitious Jews killed their Paschal Lamb, at the very same hour when the Lord Jesus was slain upon the Cross.

Thirdly, *Pentecost* was another of their Solemn Feasts, celebrated fifty days after the Paschever: and it did shadow forth ^{How Pentecost was a shadow.} Christ's sitting on the right hand of the Majesty on high, when he sent forth his Spirit in cloven Tongues, like as of fire, *Act. 2.1, 2.* which being accomplished the 50th day after his suffering, doth give us to understand, that that was the thing signified or shadowed forth by that Ceremony. For this we may take for a general Rule in accomodation of all *Moses* shadows, ^{A general Rule.} That it is the safest way to compare the Ceremony with the accomplishment of it, in Christ: as the Apostle *John* doth touching the Feast of Tabernacles, (as was shewed before) and that will guide us to a right discerning of the thing intended by that shadow.

Object. If it be objected, That the day of Pentecost that year when our Lord suffered, fell out upon the seventh day of the week, even as the first Pentecost in the Wilderness did, when the Law was given: and therefore Christ his sitting down at the Father's right-hand, and pouring out of the Spirit, may rather seem to lead us to an observance of the seventh day for a Sabbath, then of the first day of the week, as Christians generally do observe it.

Answer. I answer, It is true, That the day of Pentecost, according to Christ's own institution, hapned that year upon the seventh day of the week, as it also did when the Law was given on Mount *Sinai*. But if the words of that Text be duly weighed, *Act. 2.1, 2.* they will plainly shew us, That Christ's resting at his Father's right-hand, and pouring forth of the Spirit, was not until that seventh day was fully ended or fulfilled, as the word *συνήμεναι* doth signifie. So that when the seventh day ended, and the first day begun, then was

was the day of *Pentecost fully come*; as our Translators render those words: for whether you would chuse to take that word *fully come*, to intend the end of the true day of Pentecost, or the beginning thereof, according to the observation of the Jews, still it leads us to the end of the seventh day of the week, and beginning of the *first day*. Because, as was said before, the true day of Pentecost, according to *Moses* institution, fell out on the seventh day; but according to the superstitious Custom of the Jews of that Age, it was observed on the first day of the week; and therefore the Apostle chuseth such a word, *αυτὴν ἡμέραν*, as may comprehend both, and shew us the very nick of time when this wonderful work was done, was, when the one day ended, and the other day began. As who should say, In the conjuncture of the days, when the true day of Pentecost, according to the Law, was fulfilled; and the day of Pentecost (according to the Observation of the superstitious Jews of that Age) was newly begun, then were they in one place, &c. And for this cause, as I conceive, the Preposition *αυτῇ*, is there used. Wherefore that place in the *Acts* is so far from infringing the Rest upon the first day of the week, that it fully establisheth it, and sheweth us the very nick of time when our Lord began his Rest, namely, when the seventh day of the week (the true day of Pentecost) was completed, and the first day of the week (then observed by the superstitious Jews) was begun. From which Rest of Christ, whether initiated at his Resurrection, or consummated at his sitting down at the Father's right-hand upon the *first day* of the week; we Christians are to observe our days of Rest or publick worship by virtue of the fourth Commandment. And thus you see, that all the Feasts did shadow forth something of the body of Christ, to wit, his Birth, Circumcision, Death, and Rest at his Father's right-hand. In the next place I shall speak of new Moons.

How New
Moons are
shadows.

Now as touching them, because I meet with none that have accommodated this Ceremony, to shew us how it was a *shadow*, I shall (according to the general Rules aforementioned) compare the shadow and the accomplishment of it in Christ, and so shew wherein the shadow lay.

It is a thing well known, that at the new Moons there is a conjunction or union (as I may say) of the two great Luminaries, the Sun and the Moon: which doth darkly shadow forth (as the Apostle speaketh) the conjunction or union of the two natures of Christ in one person, when he was conceived in the Virgins wombe; which

which accordingly was fulfilled at the change of the Moon, as may easily appear, if we reckon forty weeks backward from the day of Christ's birth upon the Feast of Tabernacles, which always was celebrated at the full Moon; and (as was shewed before) did shadow forth his birth. Now forty weeks backward from that full Moon when he was born, will carry you to the time of his conception at the new Moon.

I might here shew you, that the new Moon of Christ's conception that year, (being the 1423 year after the deliverance out of Egypt, and Leap-year, or Embolimical, according to the Jewish computation) fell out upon the seventh day of the week or Sabbath, and towards the end of that day, as *Mary* the Virgin was praying or meditating upon the Word, even in the very close of that day, and in the beginning of the first day of the week, the Angel appeared to her, and she conceived by the power of the holy Ghost overshadowing her.

I might further demonstrate it from the motions of the Sun and Moon, and the conjunction of those two Luminaries, which are God's faithful Witnesses in Heaven, as *David* calleth them: but because that such Demonstrations are not so easie for every vulgar capacity to apprehend, I shall refer the further designation of the day of the month, and day of the week, wherein Christ was conceived, unto its proper place, and speak more of it in the next section of Sabbaths and Sabbatisms.

Having now spoken of Feasts and new Moons, and shewed how they were shadows of the body of Christ, it remains to shew in the third place, how Sabbaths were shadows of his body also. Now you are to know, that there were four kindes of Sabbaths or Sabbatisms, and Rests amongst the Jews, and they did all of them shadow forth something of the body of Christ to come. And all these Sabbaths or Sabbatisms fell out in the seventh Month, except the Sabbath of the seventh day, which kept its constant revolution throughout all the Months of the year: Wherefore I shall speak of the Sabbath of the seventh day in the first place, as being the first in order and time, and by way of excellency called *the Sabbath*.

The Sabbath of the seventh day of the week, as it is the seventh part of time, and doth commemorate the Lord's resting from his Work of Creation, was Moral, and depended upon the fourth Commandment. But as it held forth Christ's resting in the Grave, from all external and bodily actions, as upon that day, it is properly
How Sab-
baths are
shadows.
 and

and rightly callest by the Apostle, *a shadow*, touching something of Christ to come. For all that are acquainted with the Story of Christ's death, do know, That the body of our Lord Jesus lay onely that whole day in the Grave, and very little part either of the sixth or of the first day. So that the resting of Christ's body upon the seventh day-Sabbath, was the thing shadowed forth by the rest and cessation from work upon the Jewesh Sabbath. And therefore the Apostle reckons the Sabbath of the seventh day of the week, as well as other Sabbaths or Sabbatisms, amongst the shadows or Ceremonies of *Moses*: yea, this more especially.

Secondly, The first day of the seventh Month is called a Sabbatism or Rest: our Translation renders it *a Sabbath*, Lev. 23. 24. This day had a double shadow in it: first, as it was the new Moon, shadowing forth the conception of Christ, or the union of his two natures, as at that season of the Moon, whereof I spake in the section of new Moons. But secondly, it did shadow forth to us the very day of the week whereon Christ was conceived. For that first day of the seventh Month was instituted in *memorial of blowing trumpets*, Lev. 23. 24. And of what blowing of Trumpets was it a memorial? Doubtless, it was a memorial of the Angels rejoycing and blowing their Trumpets the *first day* of the week, when God laid the foundations of the World, *Job. 38. 7.* for we read not of any other blowing of Trumpets in all the books of *Moses*, whereof that should be a memorial. Our Translation reads it, *All the sons of God shouted for joy.* But in the Original it is said, *They blew the trumpets.* This first day therefore, God would have to be celebrated yearly, to keep in memory his great Work, when he laid the foundations of the earth upon the *first day* of the week: and also to be *a shadow* of a far greater Work to be done as upon the same day of the week, namely, the union of the two natures of Christ in one person, which was the foundation of our eternal peace and happiness.

And thus the Feast of Tabernacles became a shadow, to shew us upon what day of the week, this great and wonderful Work (or as *Isaiah* calleth it, a WONDER) should be done, namely, upon the same day of the week that God laid the foundations of the earth, which was the *first day*: Such is the perfect harmony of God's Works. And thus it pleased him to discipline his ancient People by such kinde of Rudiments, that they might be clearly convinced, that Jesus, the Son of *Mary*, in whom all things had their accom-
plish-

plishment, was indeed the Messiah promised:

Thirdly, The tenth day of the seventh Month also, which was the day of their solemn publick Fast, and was to be observed yearly; was not onely for humiliation, in regard of our first Parents transgression upon that day; but also it served to pre-figure the solemn humiliation of our Lord Jesus, the second *Adam*, for the first *Adam's* sin immediately after he returned out of the Wilderness, where he had been tempted forty days of the Devil: this day in special is called a *Sabbath* of Rest: and these are all the days, which by *Moses* and the Prophets are called *Sabbaths*.

Fourthly and lastly, The first and last days of Tabernacles are called *Sabbatisms* or *Rests*, Lev. 23. 39. And how these were shadows, hath been shewed in the section touching Feasts. Now put all these together, *Feasts, new Moons, Sabbaths*, and they make up but *one entire shadow of things to come*; or, several particulars touching the body of Christ: namely, the time of the Moon, and day of the week when he was conceived; the day of his Birth, and Circumcision; his Humiliation for our first Parents sin, which was the first publick action he did after his inauguration into his Office at his Baptism; the time and season of his Death, and lying in the Grave; and his sitting down at the Fathers right-hand. All which together, do make up a rude draught, or dark resemblance of the Messiah to come. So that we cannot retain any one of these shadows, but we shall by consequence deny the coming of Christ in the flesh; and by our practice declare, that we, together with the Jews, do expect a Messiah to come. The consideration whereof, might be sufficient to deter any sober Christian spirit from taking up such an Opinion.

I have enlarged the more upon the several particulars comprehended in the Text, (yet with as much brevity as I could) that it may appear to all unbyassed men, that all the days of publick worship appointed to the Jews, were all of them shadowy, and did hold forth something of Christ the substance: and therefore to be abrogated: for that is the Apostles main scope, to prove the abrogation of all days of Jewish worship, together with the manner of their worship. To which end, he bringeth two Arguments chiefly: the one is taken from the shadowiness of them, whereto I have already spoken: the other is fetched from Christ's consummation of them, nailing them to his cross, *Col. 2. 14.* whereunto I shall speak a little more fully, when I come to answer the Treatise of the seventh day

Sabbath. In the mean while, let this be observed by the way, that since the fall of man, God would not have any day or time for instituted worship, but with respect to Christ, and such as should either prefigure or commemorate something of Christ: all the days of worship that the Jews had, did prefigure and shadow forth something of the body of Christ to come, as hath been proved. We Christians have only one day of publick instituted worship, to wit, *the Lords day*, and that commemorates the Resurrection of Christ, and his sitting down at the Father's right-hand. As for days of *Fast* and *Thanksgiving* (which are occasional only) they also are observed, either for the absence of Christ, manifested by some tokens of his displeasure; or for the presence of Christ with us, expressed by some signal appearances of his Grace and favour towards us.

By this which hath been said, you may see, that all the days of publick instituted worship amongst the Jews, whether *Feasts*, *new Moons*, or *Sabbaths*, were all of them *shadowy*, and therefore the substance, to wit, the body of Christ, being exhibited, do necessarily vanish, and are to be abolished. Let this therefore suffice to have spoken touching the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath, in regard of the shadowiness thereof, which is the main scope I aimed at, to shew the unsoundness and invalidity of all Arguments alledged by our dissenting brethren, to prove the continuation of the Jewish Sabbath upon the seventh day of the week: for if it be a *shadow*, as the Apostle in express words speaketh, then it may not be continued after the substance is come, no more then any other *shadows* and *Ceremonies* may be.

Now having proved the abolition of the old *Jewish Sabbath*, it will be necessary to give some Ground for our Observation of the *first day* of the week, or *Lords day*, which hath as firm an institution in the fourth Commandment, as ever the *Jewish Sabbath* had. For thus I argue:

That day whereon Jehovah rested from his works, we Christians ought to rest from ours. So saith the 4th Commandment, and Heb. 4. 10.

But Jehovah our Redeemer rested from his works of Redemption upon the first day of the week, when he rose out of the Grave, and when he sate down at his Father's right-hand.

Therefore,

Now that his Resurrection was on the *first day of the week*,
is

is evident from all the Evangelists, and confessed by all: and that he sat down at his Father's right-hand upon the same day, appeareth both by the *shadow* of it, the feast of *Pentecost*; and the fruit and effect of it, the pouring forth of the Spirit, according to that saying of Christ, *If I depart, I will send him to you*: namely, when I *John* 16.7. am ascended, and set down at my Father's right-hand. And why could it not be before? verily, I can give you no Reason but this, That it was the Father's Pleasure to reserve that Royal Bounty and *Largeesse* to be bestowed by the Son himself, so soon as he was set down at the Father's right-hand in *Glory*; and had received all power, even power to send the Holy Ghost. By which gift the Disciples themselves should be assured, that he was then entered into his Rest, and had sent forth his Spirit as a Pledge and Assurance thereof, according to that word, *If I depart, I will send him to you*. And had it not been for this Reason, the Father might have sent, or the Lord Jesus might have poured forth his Spirit upon the same day that he was taken out of their sight. But that they might know he was corporally ascended, and actually entered into his Rest, and set down at his Father's right-hand, (*sitting* being an Embleme of *Rest*) he therefore reserves that bounty until the day of *Pentecost* was fulfilled.

I might urge other Arguments to prove the *first day* of the weeks Rest, from the breaking of Bread, and other Church-Acts, both from the Example of our Lord Jesus and his Apostles, as appears from sundry Scriptures in the New Testament: but I shall have occasion to speak of them in answer to that little Treatise of the perpetual, or unchangeable Morality of the seventh-day-Sabbath; whereunto I shall refer the Reader.

Observations upon the Book, called, *The Unchangeable Morality of the Seventh-day-Sabbath.*

Observ.
I.

TWO things may be noted in the Title : first, the Epithet added unto Morality, to wit, *unchangeable* ; which seems to import, that there may be some kinde of Morality that is changeable, though the Morality of the seventh-day-Sabbath be not. But because the Author hath since renounced any such distinction, as intended by him, I pass it over as an over-sight. Secondly, observe the Homonymy or equivocation of the word *seventh day* : for the seventh day, or seventh part of time may be meant as well of the first day of the seven as of the last ; each day of the week being a seventh day, or seventh part of time. Now if you take the seventh day for a seventh part of time, accounting from the Institutors Rest, according as the fourth Commandment doth, then we own it for a truth, that from the time that the Lord of the Sabbath rested from his proper work, we ought to celebrate the seventh day as a holy Rest ; and that is all which the fourth Precept doth command.

But if you appropriate it unto the seventh day of the week, as the Author of that Treatise doth, we deny it. We say, That the fourth Command, which we freely acknowledge to be Moral and unchangeable, doth not binde us Christians to the observance of the seventh day of the week, as it formerly did the Jews ; but it bindeth us now to the observation of the first day of the week, to wit, the *Lords day* : for the letter of the fourth Commandment, if it be well observed (wheresoever it is repeated by *Moses*) doth not say, Remember the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath or Rest of Jehovah thy God : but, Remember the seventh day, namely, that day of the seven wherein Jehovah thy God rested : whether it be the first or the last day of the week, the Commandment doth not particularly determine ; but the seventh day from the day of Jehovah's Rest. And so the Commandment bindeth us Christians as firmly to the observance of the first day of the seven, (which by way of excellency is called the *Lords day*) ever since our Lord Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath

** Heb. 4. 10. rested from his own proper work, and entred into his Rest *, as*

formerly it did binde the *Jews* unto the observance of the last day of the seven, wherein Jehovah the Creator rested from his works. For the first day of the week, is the day wherein Christ our Redeemer rested from his own works, to wit, the works of Redemption, whether we account it from the day of his Resurrection, which was the inchoation of his Rest, (as I may say) or from his sitting down at his Fathers right-hand, when the day of *Pentecost* was compleated, which was the consummation of his Rest. It is true, The Commandment was obligatory to the *Jews*, as upon the last day of the seven, until Christ had fulfilled that shadow, by his resting from labour in his Grave, because that was the day of the week, whereon Jehovah rested from his works of Creation. But when Christ had rested from his own works (namely of Redemption) by his Resurrection and sitting down at his Father's right-hand, then doth the fourth Command binde us to keep the seventh day from that, as a Rest or Sabbath, and none other. For so the Apostle sheweth us, that there is another day of Rest for the people of God, to be observed from the day or time, that our Lord Jesus, (the Lord of the Sabbath, *Mar. 2. 28.*) ceased from his own works, namely, works of Redemption, as God did from his works, *Heb. 4. 9, 10.* And David speaking of this day wherein Christ was mightily declared to be the Son of God, by the Resurrection from the dead, and afterwards sate down at his Father's right-hand in Glory, saith on this wise, *Psal. 118. 24. THIS is the day which Jehovah hath made; we will rejoyce and be glad in it.* *Rom. 1. 4.*

And this may serve to answer them that cry out for a word of institution for our *Lords day*, or *first day* of the weeks Rest. For though some unadvisedly have granted, that we have not a word of precept, but onely examples and presidents of Christ and his Apostles, for keeping the *first day* of the week, as a Rest or Sabbath; yet the truth is, we have as firm an institution for our *Lords day*, in the fourth Precept, as ever the *Jews* had for the seventh day. Since therefore the Lord, out of his infinite wisdom, hath so penned the fourth Command, as the Reason of the binding part is applicable to the first day of the week, as well as to the last; let no man say, we want a word of institution for it, seeing the Commandment it self is an institution: neither let them say, that the Command bindeth to the seventh day of the week: for that expression is not in the Text; onely it bindes us to the observance of that day

in the week whereon *Jehovah* rested, accounting seven days from *Jehovah's* Rest, be it on the *last day*, or be it on the *first day*, or upon any other, in case *Jehovah* had chosen to rest thereupon: for, as was said, The morality of the fourth Command doth not consist in the number of the days of the week; but in observance of that day of the week whereon the Lord himself rested from his work.

Thus much I thought good to speak in this place upon occasion of his ambiguous word, *seventh-day-Sabbath*: for we that observe the *Lords day*, or Sabbath, upon the *first day* of the week, do hold the Morality of the Sabbath every seventh day, though not beginning upon the last of the seven, as the Author of that Treatise doth; but upon the *first* of the seven, as the fourth Command requires, and all Christians do or should practice.

Observ.
2.

The next thing I take notice of, is, That about one quarter of the Book (if I mistake not) is spent in proving the Title, and the residue is taken up in Objections and Answers. So that it is hard to say what the Book it self is: whether only a *Title*, or Answers unto certain Objections against a *Title*. But I pass by that uncouth method of the Author, as suiting well enough with the Subject he handleth; and so come briefly to that which seems to be most material in his discourse.

The Author in his Arguments for proof of his Title-page, urgeth the Dignity, Perpetuity and Extent of the Moral Law or Decalogue; which we do not in the least deny, but freely acknowledge. We say, That the Decalogue and every part thereof, is of perpetual force, and bindeth all persons in all Ages, Jews and Gentiles, and is a perfect Standard for all actions of Holiness and Righteousness. We are no *Antinomians*, as his Reasons brought to fortifie his third Argument, (page 3, 4.) might seem to imply. If the Author intended to cast such an imputation upon his Brethren, that dissent in judgement and practise from himself, in this particular, he is much too blame.

Observ.
3.

Next, take notice of the weakness and unsoundness of the Author's Argument, page 4. where he saith, *That where the cause and reason of a Law is immutable, there the Law injoyning the same is immutable, &c.* I suppose the Authors meaning was to have said, That where the Cause and Reason of a thing is immutable, there the Law injoyning the same is immutable: or, where the Cause and Reason of a Law is immutable, there the Law it self is immutable.

ble : otherwise, his own words carry no good sense. But so far as I can guess at his meaning by his words, I say, his Argument is invalid to prove a perpetuity of Rest, upon the seventh day of the week; because *Jehovah*, who rested from Creating-works on the seventh day of the week, might, yea, did afterwards rest from Redeeming-work on the *first day* of the week. Therefore his Argument cannot conclude a perpetuity, as touching the seventh day of the weeks Rest, unless, first he had proved, That *Jehovah* cannot bring forth another work as great, and good, and glorious, as Creation; and having finished the same, to cease from that work. The contrary whereunto, is most true: for *Jehovah* our Redeemer, undertook the work of our Redemption, which was as great, if not greater, then Creation; and to us, as good, and better: and having finished the same, ceased from his own works, as God did from his, *Heb. 4. 9, 10.* Moreover, this Argument is corrupt and unsound, as well as weak, and may bring in the Jewish *Feast of Trumpets*, which was to be observed upon the *first day* of the seventh Month yearly, and was instituted in memorial of trumpetting. What Trumpetting? Verily, there is no Trumpetting recorded in Scripture, whereof this may be accounted a *memorial*; but that of the Angels the first day of Creation, whereof *Job* speaketh, *Job 38. 7.* The Sons of God blew their Trumpets when the Foundations of the Earth were laid. This then being the reason of that Feast, and of as long continuance as the world it self, it would follow, according to his manner of reasoning, That the Feast of Trumpets should be observed still; yet no man will think this a good Argument to prove the perpetuity of that Jewish Feast. And the Reason why this his Argument holds not, in regard of days of publick worship, is, because of the shadowiness of all days of worship, as hath been proved by the Apostle in that of the *Colossians*. *Coloss. 2. 16, 17.*

Fourthly, His fourth Reason (*page 5.*) hath four terms in it, and *Observ.* therefore concludeth not: for it is one thing to say, (as the fourth *4.* Commandment doth) that the seventh day, namely, from *Jehovah's* Rest, is to be kept holy; and another thing to say (as the Author intends it) the seventh day of the week. It is true, That the performance of Holy Duties of publick worship, doth necessarily require a set-day for that purpose, because no worship can be observed, but in time; and no time so fit, as that day which God himself hath instituted; as those (and other) Scriptures alledged by the Author, will

will fully prove : but they conclude as strongly for our observation of the *Lords day*, upon the *first day* of the week, now under the Gospel, as formerly they did conclude for the observation of the Jewish Sabbath, under the Law.

As for the Arguments which he brings to prove the fourth Commandment to be Moral, they might well have been spared, unless perhaps the Author meant to suggest, that the Observers of the *Lords day*, do deny the *moral*ity of the fourth Command : which is not so : for we do constantly avouch it, as well as himself doth ; and he himself knoweth it. We also profess the *moral*ity of the second Command, which injoyneth us to worship God in such manner as himself hath instituted : which worship under the Pedagogy of *Moses*, was Sanctuary and Temple-worship, consisting in Sacrifices, and sundry Rites and Ceremonies, which are now abrogated and changed under the Gospel, and other more suitable worship instituted : yet that impairerh not the *moral*ity of the second Commandment, which now requireth another kinde of worship, differing from what it was then. For both these Commandments, I mean, the second and the fourth, are purposely so penned by the wisdom of God, as yet they leave him at liberty to vary the manner and time of publick worship, according to his good will and pleasure under different Dispensations ; and yet the Commands themselves remain perpetually the same, as all moral Precepts be.

Observ.
5.

What the Author means by so vast a difference in point of old Administration (*pag. 7. Arg. 5.*) I do not well understand. I read in Scripture of Ministration of Condemnation, and Ministration of Righteousness, speaking of the difference of Administrations between the Law and the Gospel, the Old and New Covenant : but I finde no such distinction in Scripture, of Ministration of Moral, and Ministration of Ceremonial Law ; nor can I discern the Authors meaning. I confess there is a clear distinction betwixt the *Moral* and the *Ceremonial Law* ; but that proveth little, what the Author would have. He argueth, that because there is a distinction between the Moral and the Ceremonial Law, therefore the seventh-day-Sabbath, or Sabbath of the seventh day of the week, is *moral*. Pray you, what necessity of consequence is there in such reasoning ? Should I have said, there is a distinction of *Moral* and *Ceremonial Law*, therefore the Sabbath of the seventh day of the week is Ceremonial ; he would not have approved the manner of reasoning : yet

yet the inference had been true, though the consequence be not necessary: but this inference is neither true, nor any necessity why it should follow upon his premises. As for his sixth Argument (to prove the Morality of the fourth Command) taken from the erecting or painting thereof in Parish-Churches, it is most invalid; for what is the painting of the fourth Command in Parish-Churches, amongst the other Commandments, unto the Morality of the same? Had the Painter put an Edict of the Prince or State amongst the ten Commandments; would that have proved the morality of such an Edict? surely no. But if it be said, it argues the Painters Opinion touching the Morality of that Command, because he inserts it amongst the rest, yet that will not necessarily follow. But grant it was his Opinion, or the Opinion of those that set him to work: what's all this to prove the morality of that Commandment, or of any other? will either their painting it on the wall, or their intentions in so doing, prove the same to be moral?

The rest of his Book consists in Objections and Answers: some of which Objections are not rightly stated, nor strongly answered; as the 1, 2, 3 Objections, page 11, 12, 13, 14. which I pass by without Reply, because I would not make mistakes to appear more nor greater than needs must, and I shall only touch upon some passages that are most remarkable.

First, I shall begin with that which the Author alledgeth out *Observ.* of Mr. Willet in his Commentary upon the 20th of Exodus; 6: *where, saith Willet, the observation of the seventh day of the week is simply ceremonial: to wit, meerly or purely Ceremonial; opposing the word simple, unto that which is compound or mix'd.* To which the Author replieth, That the word *simple*, may as well be applied to the Objector, as the Objection: wantonly descanting upon the word *simple*, (which we sometimes use in another sense for a fool, as you may read, *Prov. 9.4, 16.*) putting the fool upon Mr. Willet, and others of the same judgement. Let men of sober and moderate spirits, judge whether this be an Answer sufficient, to call the Objector a fool; or the Objection, a foolish Objection. Let them be also Judge whether it be a candid or Christian course, to invert a word which hath a double signification unto the scorn and contempt of their Opponents, especially such as have been faithful servants and witnesses for Christ in their generation. I suppose it may well be said to him, as our Saviour said to his Disciples, upon another occasion, *Ye know not of what spirit ye are.*

Let all therefore that read that Book, *Try the spirits whether they be of God*, and judge in their own hearts, whether such expressions savour not too much of *Ishmael's* temper. And that I may no more take occasion to touch upon this string, I shall here collect the various expressions of the same Author, breathing forth such a kinde of distemper of spirit; wishing the Author himself to ask his own heart the question, what he meant so often to mention the Quakers, coupling them and the Observers of the Lord's day, or first day of the week, together? as pag. 12. l. 25. and pag. 114. and elsewhere. Was it not to leave some odium upon such as profess the *first day* of the week, to be our Christian Rest? If so, then consider whether he be not too blame with his Brethren. Other unfavoury expressions I meet with afterwards, wherein he doth not only reflect upon their persons, (calling them, in a way of slighting, *Observers of the first day of the week*, pag. 29. l. 43.) but vilifying *the day of the Lord* itself, calling it, in a slighting way, *a new-made Sabbath* pag. 24. l. 13. and reckoning it amongst the superstitious Trumperies of the Romish Harlot; and saith, *That Saints days are of the same lineage with the first day of the week*, p. 29. l. 43. which comes neer unto blasphemy. The very naming of these things may be sufficient ground unto any sober Christian Spirit, to suspect and diligently to examine the matter which is held forth by such unfavoury language. I may truly say, That of all the Writings upon that Subject which hitherto I have met with, I have not found such a spirit of scorn and contumely in them all, as I found in this one small Treatise. But I shall pass over these uncomfortable passages, with this caution to the Reader; not onely to try the Doctrines they read, but the Spirit of the Men that holds them forth, whether they be of God, and accordingly to receive them or reject them.

Observ.
7.

In the next place I shall come to take notice of some Scriptures quoted by the Author, passing by sundry Objections and Answers, which, with their Grains, may be allowed, as the Objections are stated, and yet the main Question remains untouched.

First therefore let me begin with that in *John 21. 1, 2, 3.* alleged, pag. 24. and shew the Author's mistake, which will wholly enervate the Author's Answer. He saith, *The Apostles were a fishing upon their new-made Sabbath*, as he terms it; and

and, that Christ on that day shewed them how to cast their nets, and therefore it could be no Sabbath: saith the Author. I confess, if the Authors Allegation were true, That the day whereon the Lord Jesus then appeared to them, as they were fishing, had been the first day of the week: it might have argued strongly against the observation of that day, as a Sabbath, or day of holy Rest. But the Author is greatly mistaken for want of examining the Text, which doth not once mention a new-made Sabbath, as he calls it, nor the first day of the week. Whereof I thought it necessary to give the Reader warning, lest he should be mistaken through over much credulity, trusting to the Author's bare relation. It was rather on the seventh day of the week, or some other day of work.

Then, to avoid that Scripture, *Act. 20. 7.* which saith, *They Observed upon the first day of the week to break bread:* the Author 8, tells us, That his judgement leads him to believe, that the day there spoken of, was one of the Sabbaths of seven weeks, or Feast of *Pentecost*; and that the breaking of bread there spoken of, cannot be understood of the mysteryes of Christ in the Supper. But behold how contrary his judgement and belief is, unto the Apostles express words: For, in the verse foregoing, the Apostle saith, *We sailed from Phillippi after the feast of unleavened bread, and came to Troas in five days; where we abode seven dayes.* All which make but twelve days, whereunto add eight days for the Feast, and it was but twenty days at most after the Paschever, and therefore cannot be meant of *Pentecost*, which was the 50th day after the Paschever, and was but of one days continuance: Wherefore the Author mistakes, to think That the first day of the week spoken of, should be the Feast of *Pentecost*; or that it was one of the days of that Feast, which had onely one day. Also, he mistakes in calling that Feast by the name of a Sabbath: for, though they might do no servile work therein, yet it is never stiled by *Moses* or the Apostles, a Sabbath: as I have formerly shewed. And it is not safe for him, or any other, to give such names unto any of God's holy Days, as the Lord himself hath not given. He might well say, His judgement leads him so to believe, but the word leads me to believe otherwise. And however the Author makes no more of breaking of bread (there mentioned) then common eating, yet the *Syriack* reads it thus: *When the Disciples came together to break the Eucharist:* namely the Bread in the

manifest mistakes. For first, he disapproved our Translation, as *the first day of the week*, and churched to render it, *the first of Sabbath*. Not observing, that both the word *Sabbath* in the singular number, and *Sabbaths* in the plural number, is put for week or weeks, as you may read if you compare *Lev. 23.15.* and *Exod. 16.9.* Wherefore he doth not well, to chuse an obscure phrase to darken the sense of the place. Secondly, he would have us believe that the word *Sabbath*, in the singular number, is to be understood of the seventh day of the week; and *Sabbaths* in the plural number, are to be understood of Ceremonial Feasts. But he is much mistaken in the true use of those words. For as I shewed before the first day of the 7th month, and the first and last days of the Feast of Tabernacles, and also the tenth day of the seventh month, are called (in the singular number) a *Sabbath*, or Sabbath-day, *Lev. 23.24, 34, 39.* And once the word *Sabbath* is put for a week, *Lev. 23.16.* compared with *Deut. 16.9.* It is true indeed, that the word *Sabbath* is generally put for the seventh day of the week's Rest; because that day is more frequent than any of the rest, and more spoken of in Scripture; yet it doth not therefore follow, that when the word is pronounced in the singular number, it must always be so understood, as I shewed before.

Again, the Author doth as much mistake the word *Sabbaths*, in the plural number: for he saith, it is to be understood of Ceremonial Feasts, and for proof thereof, quoth *Lev. 25.9.* and *26.34, 35.* which speak not of days of Feast, but years of Rest unto the Land, and release unto Servants; which Sabbatical years, are in those Scriptures called *Sabbaths*. And to say the very truth, the word *Sabbaths*, is for the most part (in Scripture) meant of the days of Rest upon the seventh day of the week, as is plain by *Lev. 23.38.* *Numb. 10.33.* *Lev. 19.4, 30.* and in many other places in *Joshua* and the Prophets: only once you read it put for weeks, *Lev. 23.15.* compared with *Deut. 16.9.* and five times the word *Sabbaths* in the plural number is used for Sabbatical years, *Lev. 25.9.* and *26.34, 35, 43.* *2 Chr. 36.21.* But it is never to be understood of Ceremonial Feasts, as he would have us.

Again, he saith, The word *Sabbath-day*, *1 Cor. 16.3.* (which we render, *the first day of the week*) is to be understood of those Ceremonial Feasts. As if the Apostle should have said, *Upon the first day of the Feast, let every one of you lay his gift, &c.* But this would be inconsistent both with Scripture phrase, and with the Apostle's

Apostles Doctrine and Practice also. For as I observed before, the word *Sabbaths*, in the plural number, is never pronounced of Feasts, by the Pen-men of holy writ. Yet suppose it were, what reason can we imagine, should move the Apostle to express himself in a dark, obscure and ambiguous word, when another word would have put the matter out of all controversy had he but said, *upon the first day of the Feasts*; which, the Author saith, was his meaning: and saith, that the word *Sabbathon*, is so to be understood in that place. Besides, how unlikely is it, that the Apostle would stir and limit their collections for the poor Saints unto one day of the Feasts? may we not rather think, that the Apostles scope was to stir up the Brethren unto a weekly contribution, when their hearts had been well warmed by the Ministry of the word, and were more enlarged to communicate to their fellow-brethren? This were more likely to accomplish the Apostles end, as it is written, *That there be no gatherings when I come.*

Moreover, this is most certain, that the Apostles never taught any of the Gentile-Churches to observe Jewish Festivals, and days of Worship; but on the contrary, he preacheth the abolition of them, as I shewed from that of the *Colossians*. And how should we then imagine, that he ever intended to give Order for collections to be made upon those days, which he so expressly forbiddeth them to observe, *Col. 2. 16.*

Thus you see, how many errors the Author runneth into at once, that he might evade the force of an Argument grounded upon that Scripture, which plainly proveth, that the Churches meetings to celebrate publick worship, and to do other Church-acts, were upon the *first day of the week.*

As for his Argument drawn from comparing, *Deut. 16. 10, 11.* with *1 Cor. 16. 2.* it hath no weight at all with it, if the words be duly weighed: for that in *Deuteronomy* speaketh of giving a Tribute of a Free-will Offering, *as the Lord hath blessed them*; or, *according to which thy God may bless thee*: and it is spoken of the Feast of Pentecost when they reaped their corn. The words in the *Corinthians* are, by our Translators, rendered, *as God hath blessed him*: others read them, *as he would be blessed or prospered of God.* And so reading the words, they have a neer affinity with the words of *Moses*, saying, that they differ in the time. The one was to be done once in the year, at the Feast of Pentecost, and the other ever first day of the week. Yet I should rather chuse to

read the words thus: *Let every one lay by him in store, which may be blessed of God; or, may have a prosperous conveyance,* given by God according to the desire of their hearts, for releif of the poor Saints at *Jerusalem*: for when any thing according to the purpose, intention or desire of our hearts, is blessed of God, unto the ends we aimed at, this is, *ex opere operantis*. And this I conceive was the Apostles meaning in that phrase, to strengthen their Faith in assurance, that what they did with free hearts contribute, God would take care for the safety of its conveyance to the relief of their brethren. Now if you read the words thus: then they hold forth a quite other matter to that which *Moses* saith. But read the words as you please, yea, so as may most favour the Author's scope; nay suppose the word to be one and the same: yet it will not follow from the identity of words, that *Paul* and *Moses* must needs speak of the same time. It is not the sameness of the thing done, or sameness of the manner of doing, that doth infer the sameness or identity of time; because the same duty may be performed in the same manner, at several seasons. He might as well reason from resemblance and likeness, that *Hannah* and *Elizabeth*, two sisters, that resemble each other in feature, in stature, in speech and deportment, &c. are one and the same individual person, because of their likeness one to the other. And though the Author of that Treatise say it is meant of Pentecost, the Jewish Feast: yet you see that that cannot be, because it was antiquated to the Jews, and utterly forbidden the Gentile Christians. All which considered, it will appear, That the Authors Answer doth not in the least infringe the Argument drawn from that Scripture, to prove the observation of our Rest upon the first day of the week. For if the Apostle did enjoin the Churches to convene upon that day; and being met together, they did celebrate the Supper, and communicate to the necessities of the Saints (which are proper and peculiar acts of Church-power and order) and if Christ himself did break bread and bless it, and gave it the Disciples upon that day, and by those actions they discerned him to be the Lord*, then it argueth strongly, that the first day of the week was set apart not onely by the Apostles, but by our Lord Jesus himself, for duties of publick worship.

The Author saith, That by the Lord's day, *Rev* 1. 10. is not meant the first day of the week, but the seventh day; because the seventh day is called the Sabbath of the Lord by God, *Exod.* 20.

* *Lu.* 24. 30. which words there used, are the very same that he used in his institution of the supper. And therefore I doubt not, but he did by that commemorate his death, & so made himself known to these two Disciples.

Observe.
10.

10. But to omit what I said before, that it is not written the seventh day of the week, &c. yet the variation of the phrase is observable: for *Moses* doth not call the seventh day of the week the *Lords day*, or day of the Lord, (which phrase is usual amongst the Prophets, as *Isa. 13. 6.*) Neither doth *John* say, I was in the Spirit upon the Sabbath day, or upon the seventh day of the week; but he saith, *I was in the spirit on the Lords day.* Now had the Spirit which breathed both in *Moses* and *John* intended the same thing in both places, we may well conceive he would have used the same phrase of speech. And if we will give any respect to the Syriack Translation, (which seems to be made in the first Century, whilst some of the Apostles lived) you shall finde that where the Greek doth read it, the *Lords supper*, 2 Cor. 11. 21. the Syriack renders it the *Lords day*; as being the day whereon they were wont to celebrate the Supper; which was upon the first day of the week, as was shewed before.

And if any shall ask me what reason might move the Apostle to call the first day of the week the *Lords day*:

I answer: first, It may be so called by the Apostle, to shew that that day was instituted by himself in room of the Sabbath upon the seventh day of the week: for he was Lord of the Sabbath, and had power to institute, abrogate, and dispence with the Rest; as he proves by several instances, and by the present case of his Disciples; and therefore he had power to abrogate and alter: for, *eu-jou est instituer, eju est destituer.*

Secondly, it may be called *his day* in special manner, because he chose that day, whereon to break bread with his Disciples after his Resurrection; secretly instructing them thereby, that he had set it apart for such duties of publick worship.

Thirdly, it may be called the *Lords day*, because it was the day whereon he was conceived and born, the day whereon he was baptized; and afterward humbled for the first *Adam's* sins: it was also the day on which he rose again and brake bread with his Disciples, as I have said: and the day whereon he sat down at his Fathers right hand, and poured forth his Spirit. In all which respects the Apostle might well call it the *LORD'S DAY*. Wherefore the slight Answer wherewith the Author thinks to remove the force of this Text, doth not at all satisfie, nor in the least detract from the truth held forth; namely, that the first day of the week, is, by way of excellency, called the *Lords day*. And had he considered

sidered well before he wrote, what the meaning of Lordship over the Sabbath means. I suppose he would not so easily have thought to blow away the argument grounded upon this Text.

Again in answer to that Text, *Heb. 4. 10.* he is pleased to say, That that Scripture onely comprehends a parallel betwixt the temporal and eternal *Canaan*. But if the matter be well weighed, I suppose we shall finde the Apostles scope to be more then so. For you observe, That the Apostle having to deal with the Jews, he labors by manifold arguments throughout that Epistle to take them off from resting upon *Moses*, and all *Mosaical* Rites and Worship; and so leads them to Christ, of whom *Moses* prophesied, and to whom *Moses* was but a servant; that from him they might take all their directions for Worship, both as to the Worship it self, and also the time and manner thereof: assuring them that he was as faithful as they could possibly apprehend *Moses* to be. And because no Worship can be performed without a time limited for that purpose; and Christians now were not to observe the same days of Worship, as the Fathers of old did; the Apostle gives them a Reason of the same, in one principal day of Worship; namely, the Sabbath: which notwithstanding doth not in the least infringe the Morality of the fourth Commandment. For he which is entred into his Rest, to wit, Jesus the Mediator of the New Testament, hath also ceased from his own works, as God did from his; and therefore our observation of the first day in the week, doth not at all hinder the Morality of the Command. For whilst the Ground and Reason of our Rest, is the same it was before, (namely, *Jebo-vah's* Rest from his works) the Morality of the Precept is not wronged: but the Ground of our Christian Rest is the same: therefore. Now that the ground of our Rest is the same which the fourth Commandment requires, he proveth, because saith he, *Jesus that is entred into his Rest, he also hath ceased from his own works as God did from his.* As if he should have said, You Jews keep a Rest upon the seventh day, because God rested as that day from his works of Creation: we Christians celebrate the first day of the week, because on that day Christ rested from his work of Redemption, which is as great and glorious a work, and of as great good, and more, to us, then the work of Creation: and the Commandment bindes us as firmly to the later, as it did you unto the former.

Quest. If then the question be, *When did Christ cease from his works?*

E

Ans.

Observ.
II.

Answ. I answer: first, negatively, That this cessation is not to be understood of the time of his lying in the Grave; for that was but a cessation from external actions, as upon that day, whereof the 7th day Sabbath was a shadow, and therefore was abolished, when Christ had actually fulfilled it. This his lying in the Grave was a part of his work, and was indeed the last and lowest degree of his humiliation: therefore his work of Redemption was not finished till he rose again.

Secondly, I answer, That Christ rested from his works upon that day whereon he rose again, and sat down at his Father's right-hand. His Resurrection was the beginning (as I may say) of his *Rest*; and the other, the completing of the same; which is fitly set forth by his posture of sitting, a proper Embleme of *Rest*. And if we would rightly understand, when Christ entered into his *Rest*, or ceased from his works; let us consider what is meant by God's works, and his ceasing; and what is meant by Christ's works, and his ceasing from his own works. Doth not Christ say, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work?* How then is it said, God ceased from his works? *Answ.* There be works of Creation, works of Providence, and works of Redemption. Now God ceased from works of Creation upon the seventh day of the week. 2. There be works of Providence, and from them there is no intermission; but the Father and Son both are at work still. 3. There are works of Redemption, which being accomplished, Christ resteth from them: and his cessation from those works, is the ground of our *Rest*, and of our observance of the *Lords day*, grounded upon the fourth Commandment.

Observ.
1. 2.

In the last plaist place, he makes a seeming (and in my judgement, a weak) answer to that place of Scripture, *Col. 2. 16, 17.* which place, rightly understood, doth fully abrogate the seventh day of the week Sabbath, and all other Ceremonial days of worship, as I have shewed before. All which (like shadows) did flee away at Christ's death, as *Salomon* prophesied of them, *Cant. 2. 17.* and *4. 6.* Onely I think it necessary to add a few words for further clearing of that Text: which is the most pregnant place to prove the abrogation of all *Mosaical* worship and days of worship. And because the Author in answering that Scripture, strangely jumbleth three Scriptures together, (namely, *Gal. 5. 1. Eph. 2. 15. Col. 2. 14.*) saying, *That in the seventh-day-sabbath, there is nothing contrary to us Gentiles, nor any yoke of bondage, or servitude, as*

Col. 2. 14.
Gal. 5. 1.
Eph. 3. 16.

that

that it needed to be slain, or d taken out of the way : The confu- d Col. 2. 14.
 sion of his Answer, argueth the confusion of his spirit in his Reply.
 I shall therefore briefly unfold the words of these several Texts, and
 by that it will the better appear to the Reader, how little he hath
 answered to the question. The first word *blotting out*, Col. 2. 14.
 doth signifie such a kinde of obliteration, as leaveth no tittle or foot-
 step of the thing remaining : see *Zanchy* upon this Text. It is a me-
 taphorical speech taken from accountants ; which when a debt was
 paid, were wont to blot it quite out, that it might not be charged
 upon the debtor any more. The *hand-writing of ordinances*, are
 all Ceremonial Institutions. The word *ἡμῶν*, against us, as our
 Translation reads it, doth also signifie, according to us ; and is so
 translated *ε*, and so I conceive it ought to be rendered in this place.
 So then the meaning of the Apostle, I conceive to be this, *That the* e Rom. 9. ii.
hand-writing of ordinances, or *Mosaical Rites* and institutions,
 which is according to us, suited to the Jewish Pedagogy and
 framed according to the state of that people, is blotted out, and
 quite obliterated by Christ : amongst which Ordinances, he
 reckoneth all the Jewish Sabbaths, as a part. But afterwards,
 when he saith, * *which was contrary to us* ; it implies, That those * O ἡμῶν
Mosaical institutions, however they were suited unto their state, ὡς ἡμῶν.
 yet they were secretly against them, and adversaries to them, as the
 word imports. They were secretly against the Jews, that trusted to
 make up their defect of obedience to the Moral Law, by observation
 of such Ceremonies ; and so whilst they looked for justification f Rom. 9.
 thereby, they fell short of the righteousness which is by faith : they 31, 32.
 were also against the Gentiles, because they stood as a wall of par-
 tition betwixt the g Jews and them, until Christ removed them : g Eph. 2. 14
 way, and brake down this wall of partition. This wall of partition
 was an occasion of *h* enmity between Jews and Gentiles. And was h Eph. 2. 16.
 it not then needful that these should be slain as the Apostle speaketh
 was there not need to remove these out of the way ; nailing them to
 his cross ? So then, as the Jews nailed Christ upon the cross, and
 slew him ; even so these ceremonies and shadows are by Christ
 nailed to his cross, and slain.

And thus you see the nulling and abolition of all types and
 shadows, the time when, and the means whereby it was effected,
 to wit, the death of Christ upon the cross. From whence we may
 conclude, That all Ceremonies and shadows of Christ, without
 exception, were against the Jews, both as they were a yoke of bon-

dage; and as they became an occasion of stumbling to the carnal Jews, who did expect justification thereby; they also were against the Gentiles, because they stood as a partition-wall; and therefore needful they should be done away.

I believe the Author would let all shadows go, saving this of the *Sabbath upon the seventh day of the week*, which he would have to escape out of the overthrow. He is as tender of this, as *Lot* was of *Zoar*, or *Jonah* of his Gourd. I know it will be hard to convince by Arguments, except the Spirit, whose Office it is to convince, do undertake the work, and breath in poor weak instruments. But if once the Spirit do come, and open all these Scriptures, and clear up to our hearts what these shadows be, and how Feasts, New Moons and Sabbaths, even all of them, are shadows, or make up one entire shadow of Christ to come; then will carnal Reason vanish, and all our former darkness, which misled us, vanish as dew before the Sun: and then we shall plainly see, and not till then, that we cannot retain any part or parcel of these Legal Constitutions; but we do by consequence deny, that Christ the substance is come.

Briefly therefore to conclude, I shall winde up all with a word or two of Advertisement: first, to the Author of that Treatise, and all others that shall write Books, to weigh their words, and examine the Scriptures, and let your Language be the Language of *Canaan*, and not of *Ashdod*; or as the Apostle saith, *Let your speech* (and writing) *alway be with grace, seasoned with salt*, Col. 4. 6. Secondly, let me speak two words to such as are Readers of other mens writings: 1. weigh the matter and the words also, in the balance of the Sanctuary: search the Scriptures, whether things be so, ere you give credit to every bold assertion. 2. Try (not onely the Doctrines and Positions, but also) the Spirit that breathes therein, 1 *John* 4. 1. and if you finde a Spirit of scorn and blasphemy, or self, take heed of it; and the Lord give you understanding in all things.

HAVING met with another large Treatise, without the Author's name, intituled, *The Morality of the fourth Commandment*: divided into seven Chapters, pleading for the seventh-day-Sabbath; and perceiving that some tender spirits are too much taken with it, and it may be the more for the Author's sake, who is a godly man: I thought good, at the request of a Brother, to speak something briefly to the several Chapters, the Arguments and Scriptures therein alledged, to shew how little weight there is in all of them, (together considered) to prove that the seventh-day-Sabbath, (observed by the Saints before our Lord Jesus resurrection) is binding to us Christians. In handling whereof, I shall deal candidly and tenderly, as I may: concealing the Authors name. Yet to avoid tediousness, I must briefly sum up the chapters, and take only the marrow or substance of them, such as seem to carry any shew of Argument with them: and that I may follow the Authors method I shall distribute my answer into seven parts, according to his seven Chapters.

To the first Chapter.

The substance of the first Chapter, is, That the World is credulous of Error, and blinde as to Truth; and that long Custom, and old Tradition, strengthened with Wit and Learning, prevaileth to give credit to Error; and that the brightest Star in the Church, will become dark if God withhold his Light; and that God hath designed some distinguishing Truth to every Age; and that the multitude will sooner take up stones to throw at the Truth, then Scriptures to examine it by, &c.

Unto all which I say, 'Tis true: But alas! what is this to prove the seventh-day-Sabbath? may not Papists, Arminians, &c. say as much for sundry of their Opinions? yea, doth it not rather make against the seventh-day-Sabbath, to say, That God hath designed some distinguishing Truth to every Age? is it not plain, That one distinguishing Truth of the Saints before Christ, was their Rest upon the 7th day, to wit, that day on which the Creator rested from his works of Creation? And since Christ's Resurrection, doth not this distinguish the Christians or new Saints from those old Saints, that they keep their Rest upon the first day of the week, on which our Lord

Lord Jesus did rise, and rest from his works of *Redemption*? But methinks the Author's words, *pag. 7.* may be an Answer sufficient to that whole Chapter. For (saith he) the whole stream of the practice of the Godly, is generally against this Opinion, which he holdeth forth: and if so, it would be a Christians wisdom, to take heed how he runs contrary to the whole stream of Godly men; for such *God doth lead in pathes of righteousness for his names sake.* As for his Exhortation to renounce our own parts and wisdom, and to depend upon the Father of light, &c. it is good, and wholesome, and may very fitly be recommended to himself, and others of his judgement.

Thus much I thought necessary to say unto his first Chapter, to shew the Reader, how useless it is, to make good his Position, and so proceed to the next.

To the second Chapter.

In this Chapter the Author argues for the seventh-day-Sabbath upon this Ground, because it is generally counted Jewish, which (saith he) is a *nickname*. Had he said a *distinguishing* name, it had been more proper; for so the Old Testament-Saints are called *Jews*, and New Testament-Saints are called *Christians*. And these are not nick-names; but proper and distinguishing names. Yet should we argue for our *Lords day* upon the same ground, because himself, and those of his judgement call it *Antichristian*, (which is indeed a *nick-name*, or worse.) the Author would esteem it a weak kinde of reasoning; and well might he so do.

Then he produceth another Argument for the seventh-day-Sabbath, from the number of *seven*, which, he saith, comes of a root that signifieth *fulness*. Suppose the root did signifie *fulness*, what would that prove as to the morality of the day? But the Author in this doth much mistake himself; for the word שבע, which signifieth *seven*, comes of שבע, *to swear*; or rather, it self is the root thereof. The root that signifieth *fulness*, is שבע, and written with *Sin*, not with *Shin*; and by the Grammarians it is made a distinct root. Therefore the Author should have been better advised, ere he had put an occasion of stumbling, before such as are ignorant of that Tongue, or discovered his own weakness in publishing such a thing without examination. *Job* counteth it a fault in his friends; that they speake either perversly or fraudulently for God, *Job 13.7.* Af-

Afterwards he proceedeth to argue for the seventh day, from the institution thereof in Paradise; from the Father's Rest, and from the Saints Rest in Heaven, and from Christ's resting in the Grave on that day: as also, because the Tables were put into the Ark, therefore the seventh day is moral and perpetual.

To which fragments, I answer: First, That the institution of the seventh day in Paradise, doth not prove it moral. For, by the same Reason, we might argue that the Tree of Life, and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, (which were Sacraments instituted in Paradise) were moral and perpetual. Indeed the Fathers *resting* on the seventh day from works of Creation, was Ground enough for man to rest from his labour, upon that day, until the Redeemer (who was Lord of the *Sabbath*, as well as his Father, and, as Lord, had power to alter and abrogate, as well as institute:) I say, until the Redeemer had instituted another day, in memorial of his own resting from works of Redemption, as his Father had done from his proper works of Creation. Now the day of Christ's resting from his proper works of Redemption, was not on the seventh day of the week, as the Author would make us believe; but upon the first day of the week. For, though he lay in the Grave upon the seventh day, and rested from all actions of life, as upon that day; yet his very lying in the Grave, was the last and lowest degree of his humiliation, and part of his work of Redemption. For, if Christ be not raised, our Faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins, 1 Cor. 15. 17. wherefore his redeeming work ended not till he rose from the Dead, and then did his Rest begin, and not before. His Rising was the beginning of his Rest, and his sitting down at his Father's right-hand, was the completing (as I may say) of his Rest: and both the one and the other, was upon the first day of the week, which we Christians do celebrate as a *Rest*, in obedience to the fourth Commandment.

As touching the Saints Rest in Heaven, let the Reader take notice, That the Scripture nowhere saith, That they do rest upon the seventh day of the week, or observe that day above any other day: nor is there any distinction of days or nights there. And as for the putting the Tables in the Ark, it yields no demonstrative argument for the morality of the seventh day, nor yet for any of the Commandments. The placing the fourth Commandment in the Tables, rather argues it to be moral, than the placing of the Tables in the

in the Ark. For by that argument, *Manna* and *Aaron's Rod* might be counted unoral and perpetual, (which were improper) for they also were put in the Ark, yet they were not moral nor perpetual, but they are done away.

His argument also for the seventh days morality from the Prophets mentioning the *Sabbath* amongst other things moral, (*Isai.* 58. and 56. *Ezek.* 20, and 22.) is of as little force as the former. For by the same reason, burnt *offerings*, and legal *sacrifices*; yea, the *Temple* it self might be counted moral and perpetual, because they are mentioned in the same place amongst things that are moral. But such kinde of reasoning the Author himself would disallow.

Further, the Author reasons from the name Sabbathism, שבתון, *Exod.* 16. 23. (which phrase is also used, *Heb.* 4. 9.) that the seventh-day-Sabbath is moral: but if that argument were good, it would prove the tenth day of the seventh month, or the day of their yearly Fast to be moral; for it is called by the same name, a Sabbathism, שבתון, *Lev.* 16. 31. and 23. 31. And so also the Feast of Tabernacles, or Nativity of our Lord, and the Feast of Trumpets, or the day of his Conception; for they also are called, שבתון, Sabbathisms, *Lev.* 23. 24, 29. though our Translation renders it *a Sabbath*; so also is the 7th day yeer called, *a Sabbathism*, *Lev.* 25. 5, 6. Yet I hope the Author will not say, that any of these are moral; And as for *Remes* calling the seventh *dies Sabbati*; it hath no more weight in it to prove the morality of the seventh day, then it would to prove the morality of the first day, or our Lords day, because they call it *dies Dominicus*.

Thus have I briefly touched the several arguments couched by the Author in his second Chapter, and shewed the invalidity of them to evince the truth of his assertion.

To the third Chapter.

In the third Chapter he proceeds to New Testament-proofs, as he says. And first he enquires where the seventh-day-Sabbath, (or Jewish Sabbath) was abrogated?

To which I answer, That it is called a *Shadow*, and abrogated, *Col.* 2. as all other days of legal worship were, namely, *New Moons*, *Fasts*, or holy days; for though the Author would persuade us, That the Apostle in that place keeps off from the least re-
flexion

flexion upon the *seventh day Sabbath*, as a perishing figure (which it's likely he feared, an unbiassed Reader would be apt to interpret the Text;) yet with his leave let me say, That the *seventh day Sabbath* is as much, if not more especially intended by the Apostle in that place. For so the word there used in the plural number, *Sabbaths*, doth imply. And I finde no other days or time called *Sabbaths*, which are distinguished either in Old Testament or New, from New Moons or Feasts, saving the *seventh day Sabbath*, the yearly Fast, and the seventh Year. And therefore if any Sabbath was intended above another to be abolished, it was the *seventh day Sabbath*, which was the most usual day of Jewish worship. But the truth is, all days or times of rest, wherein Legal Worship was performed, was by the Apostle made null and void; and by consequence, the Legal Worship it self. Yes, the seventh Year, which was not a stated time for Worship, but onely a shadow of something touching Christ to come, was by the same Text abrogated.

I know, That such as reason for the *seventh day Sabbath*, do say, That by *Sabbaths* is meant the days of the Feasts, &c.

But to that I answer, That such a gloss would confound *New Moons*, *Feasts*, and *Sabbaths* together, which the Prophets and Apostles have ever reckoned distinct. And should that be the meaning, the word (*Sabbaths*) would be superfluous, had it been comprehended in the *New Moons*, and *Feasts* mentioned before.

Secondly, I say, That besides the seventh day Sabbath the yearly Fast, and the seventh Year, I finde not any day or time called a *Sabbath*, either by *Moses*, or the Prophets, or Apostles; and therefore we have reason to reject such a private interpretation of the word.

Now whereas the Author mentions that in *Luke 23.56*. where it is said, That they rested on the *Sabbath*, according to the Commandment.

I answer, That those words do not infer a perpetuity of the day, but onely prove their conscientious observance of the seventh day Sabbath, according to the Commandment. For so it was meet and necessary, until our Lord Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath, had fulfilled that shadow, by his lying in the Grave, and till by his rising out of the Grave, and resting from his works of Redemption, he had instituted another day of rest, in memorial of his rest,

distinct from the day of the Creator's rest, as the Apostle speaks, *Heb. 4. 8.* Had the day of his rest, & the Creator's day, been one and the same; what need the Apostle say it was *another day*? And let me commend this to the Readers consideration, that though the Scripture takes notice of the Disciples resting according to the Commandment, immediately before the Resurrection; yet never do they speak of resting, nor of resting according to the Commandment (as upon that day) after the Resurrection. As for the Text alledged, *Act. 13. 43, 44.* it onely proves, that *Paul* preached on the Jewish Sabbath, and he gives the reason of that practice, because the people were then congregated. This was no gross temporizing, as the Author calls it: for had they not met together, how could he have preached to them? and had they met any other day of the week, it would have been either in season or out of season, and very lawful for him to have preached the Word. And whereas he alledgeth our Saviour's preaching on that seventh day Sabbath, I acknowledge that Christ so did; yea, he did it in obedience to the Commandment, as the day of the Lord's rest: for at that time the seventh day was not abolished, but stood in force, until himself had fulfilled it, and so abrogated that shadow, and till he, as Lord of the Sabbath, had instituted another rest.

Further, the Author proceedeth to alledge, *Act. 2.* for proof of his assertion, and saith, it was upon the seventh day of the week that the Spirit was poured forth, the Apostles preached, and three thousand were converted, added to the Church, and baptized: he might also have added, breaking of bread, or the Supper, mentioned, *vers. 24.* And he may well call these actions *signal characters* of our *Christian Sabbath* or *Rest*. But upon what day of the week were all these things done? He saith, upon the seventh day of the week: but if we duly weigh the words, it will appear plainly, that these things were done upon the first day of the week, or the *Lords day*. The words of the Text run thus: *When the day of Pentecost was fully come*, (fulfilled or completed, as the word signifieth) *then were they with one accord, &c.* and then was the Spirit poured forth, &c. It is very true, as the Author observes, that the true day of Pentecost, according to the Law, (which was observed by the Apostles) fell out that yeer upon the seventh day of the week, or Jewish Sabbath. But the season when the Spirit was poured forth, was, when that day was compleated and fulfilled, and the first day of the week begun. So that the day of Pentecost having

having been duely observed by the Apostles, who waited for the promise of the Father, and had spent the day in seeking God for it; in the very closure of that day, just as the first day of the week began, Christ sent forth the Spirit in that extraordinary manner; which being noised about the City that evening, it seems the people of all Languages convened the next morning betimes, to be satisfied about it: for it was about the third hour of the day, (or as we say, nine a clock in the morning) when Peter began his Apology. Thus have I gained one New Testament argument from the Author, to prove the first day of the week to be *characterized* above all other days of the week as the day which Christ hath chosen in a peculiar manner, to dispenche his word, to pour out his Spirit and spiritual gifts; and for his people (being congregated in holy fellowship) to dispenche both *baptism*, and the *supper*. These things considered, I commend it to our dissenting brethrens consideration, what day can be so fitly called *the Lords day*, by way of excellency; as this day which he hath so signally designed unto such spiritual ends? And that the Reader may be more fully satisfied, that all these things were done upon the first day of the week, let me express a little further the emphasis of the word *συνελεύσθαι*, which is a compound word, and signifieth to *fill up* and *together*. For by the way you may note, that as the superstitious Jews observed their Passeeover, that yeer, the day after the true day of Passeeover kept by Christ and his Apostles; so also did they keep their Pentecost, the day after the Apostles kept the true Pentecost. So then the full meaning of that word *συνελεύσθαι*, seems to me to be thus much. In the congress of these two days, when the true day was fully come, and expiring; and the day observed by the Jews (at that time) began, then were they met together, &c. And this I take to be imported in that phrase: shewing unto us the very nick of time, when Jesus, being ascended, and set down at his Fathers right-hand, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he shed it forth, *Act. 2. 33, 34.*

A little after, the Author nameth St. *Augustine*, St. *Luke*, St. *Peter* &c. which I only mention as a warning to Saints, that they follow not the example of any, though godly, in taking up such stiles from Antichrists Iordination, to attribute them to those that are at rest, except they can finde a Scripture-warrant for it. But I pass that by.

The place alledged by him, *Act. 2. 12.* it only proves the length

of a journey practised by the Saints upon the day of rest; it neither proves the morality of the seventh day, or any other, directly. And whereas he saith, the Apostle discourseth only of the six days, *Rom. 14. 5, 6.* Let the Reader take notice, that there is not any such word in the Text, as *six days*: it rather seems to be spoken of *Mosaicall holy days*, which at that time were yet retained by the Jews, who would not be perswaded of their abrogation.

The Text which the Author quotes (*Job. 19. 20.*) doth not say, as the Author of that book saith, That the work of redemption was finished when Jesus was on the cross; nor indeed was it finished when he spake those words, *It is finished.* For, as then, he was not dead, nor laid in his grave; both which were parts of that work: that therefore which he saith *is finished*, is, that now he had offered up himself to the death, even that cursed death of the cross, which was the last act he had to do whilst he was alive. As for his resting in the grave, I shewed before, that that was part of the work of redemption; and that his resting from that, which properly was the Redeemers work, was his rising out of the grave upon the first day of the week. Wherefore I shall conclude my answer to that third Chapter, with this Position; That since Christ (first) rested from his redeeming works upon the first day of the week, and afterwards the Disciples observed the same; it is most safe for us to keep that day for a day of holy rest.

To the fourth Chapter.

The fourth Chapter is mostly spent in arguments against the first day of the week: for, saith he, Christs appearing to his Disciples on that day, *Job. 20.* the collections made that day for the poor Saints, *1 Cor. 16.* the title which some give it, *The Lords day*; and *Paul's* breaking of bread, *Act. 20.* are but examples; they are not commands, nor do they carry the force of a command or institution.

I answer, They are not express commands indeed, yet they are equivalent to a command, and of the like force: for it is written, *Be followers of God as dear children*, *Eph. 5. 1.* and again, *Be followers of me, as I also am of Christ*, *1 Cor. 11. 1.* But to stoop to the weakness of these brethren, I would wave the arguments drawn from Christs example, or the Churches practise, and close with them in search after a word of institution. And let all such brethren understand, that we who hold the first day of the week, have a firm word of

of institution for our practice, to wit, the fourth Commandment. For that Commandment, rightly interpreted, bindes us not absolutely (*in terminis*) to an observation of the seventh day of the week, as our dissenting brethren urge it; but unto the *seventh day*, counting from Jehovah's rest, as I shewed before in the former Treatise. So that had Jehovah rested upon the seventh day, or first day, or any other day of the week, from that which was his proper work; the fourth Command would binde us, to count from thence six days, and to rest upon the *seventh day* from that rest of Jehovah. Now there being but two days on which Jehovah rested from his proper work, namely, the *seventh*, wherein the Creator rested; and the *first day* of the week wherein the Redeemer rested; the fourth Commandment (by the wisdom of Christ) is so penned, that it bindes all the New Testament-Saints, since his Resurrection, as firmly to observe the *first day* of the week holy, as it did the Saints of the Old Testament unto the *seventh day*.

His argument grounded upon a mis-application of *John 14.2.* taken from the unlikelihood, that Christ would have concealed it from his Apostles, if he had intended the first day should be observed as a rest; it is invalid, and might be retorted upon himself. For by the same reason it may be said, that if Christ had intended the seventh day should be the day of New Testament-worship, Christ would have told them. The next Scripture urged by the Author, is somewhat wronged by him: for it is not said, *John 13.14.15.* he concealed nothing from them; but, *all things I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you*: which yet must be warily interpreted because he had not yet shewed them, what Officers he meant to have in his Churches, and many other things concerning his Kingdom, which were reserved till after his Resurrection, to be revealed, *Act. 1.3.*

Another argument he brings against the first day of the week, because Christ appeared to his Disciples as they were fishing; therefore neither did the Apostles keep it as a Sabbath, nor did Christ so esteem it. But for answer to that let it be considered, that that Scripture, *John 21.* doth not at all mention the day of the week. It might as well be imagined, to be the seventh day, or any other day of the week, as the first day of the week: therefore I pass it by as an argument that hath no footing in the Text. As for the story fetched out of the Popish Legend, it is not worthy an answer, nor fit to be brought in, in this case.

Another argument is brought *Job. 20.* compared with *Luk. 23. 56.* to prove, That the first day of the week was not observed by *Mary* as a *rest*, because they bought spices on that day. To which I answer, that as yet Christ had not appeared to them, nor declared his minde for observation of that day; and therefore no marvel if they did not observe it as a day of holy *rest*. 2. I answer, That the spices were not prepared on the first day of the week, but on the sixth, and they rested on the Sabbath, which was not as then abrogated or altered. But never do we read of buying, or selling, or fishing upon the first day of the week, after the Lord Jesus had appeared to his Disciples after his Resurrection.

Further, the Author alledgeth *Act. 20. 7.* and saith, it is not powerful enough to constitute a Sabbath. To this I answered in the beginning of this fourth Section or Chapter. And though he say, That the phrase, *breaking of bread*, *κλίσμα ἄρτου*, in no place is used for the Lord's Supper: he is greatly mistaken. For he may read that phrase, *Mat. 26. 26. Mar. 14. 23. 1 Cor. 10. 16. & 11. 24.* which cannot otherwise be understood but of the Supper. And in this very place, *Act. 20. 7.* the Syriack reads it, They came together to break the *Eucharist*, or Lord's Supper. Indeed, that breaking of bread mentioned, *v. 11.* is readied by the Syriack, as breaking of common bread for our usual repast. And whereas the Author saith, that the phrase of breaking bread is first used, *Luk. 24. 35.* and that it hath reference unto *Mar. 16. 14.* where it is said, that the eleven were at supper in *Jerusalem*: he is guilty of a double mistake. For *Mark* makes mention of breaking bread with his Disciples after the Passover, & that mentioned by *Luke*, was his breaking bread at *Emmanuel*. 3. It is another wrong to say, that the breaking bread, *Luk. 24. 35.* is to be referred unto *Mar. 16. 14.* For the one was *Emmanuel*, the other at *Jerusalem*. And there was onely two Disciples in the one place, and eleven in the other. Besides, *Mark* saith, They were at supper in *Jerusalem*; but says not a word of breaking bread. But if all were true as he relates it, yet it would argue nothing against our Lords day: only I note the mistakes, that the Reader may not rely too much upon the credit of the Author.

And whereas he saith, That the Supper was first administered upon the week days I answer, that grant it so to be, what will that weaken the morality of the first day, or Christian rest, or our breaking bread thereupon? The place alledged, *Rev. 1. 10.* where the Apostle speaks of the Lords day, I would not press it as a demonstrative argument, for

for sanctification of the 1 day of the week: yet if we compare it with 1 Cor. 11. 20. as the Syriack reads it, it may be a *cumulative* argument, or an argument *ex abundanti*: for the Apostle there reproving the abuse of their love-feasts, saith, *When ye come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lords supper.* In the Syriack it is read, *When ye come together, ye do that which is not lawful on the Lords day: ye eat, and ye drink, &c.* Which implies thus much, that in those primitive times, when that Translation was made (the Apostles some of them still living) it was the practice of the Churches, to celebrate the *Supper* upon the *Lords day*. Now that the Saints did break bread upon the first day of the week, is evident, *Act. 20. 7.* and other places.

To the fifth Chapter.

This Chapter speaks mostly to siaging, anoyating with Oyl, and a holy kiss; but these do nothing concern the day of Sabbath, to prove the morality of it, either upon the first day or last day of the week, and therefore I wave them. Only I must note something of that kiss, which he saith may be in publick, either before or after Prayer, Love-feasts, or Lords Supper; as a token of perfect unity, love, conjugal affection, and singleness of heart, &c. But if such practices be used amongst Saints at such times, and for such ends, (for which he brings no Scripture-proof, only he saith it) let sober humble Christians judge how suitable, or rather how unsuitable it would be for a divine Ordinance. Touching the Sabbath he saith nothing, saving that he tells us how Antichrist, the little Horn, hath destroyed both the second and fourth Commandment. Which, let it be granted; yet it proves nothing for the seventh day Sabbath, nor against our Lords day.

To the sixth Chapter.

I finde nothing in this Chapter that is argumentative to the subject in hand. He tells us of the offence which the Jews took at Christ's Disciples for plucking of ears of corn on the Sabbath day; and against Christ himself, for curing a blinde man upon that day. But those Scriptures speak nothing to the perpetuity or morality of the seventh day Sabbath: only they prove that the Jews were superstitiously strict in the observation of that day. As for the stories he tells

our of *Parabase*, touching the Jewish superstitious observations of the Sabbath, and the story of a Sabbatical River that ceaseth running on that day (which is fabulous) they make nothing to the point. Then he concludes that Chapter with this Christian motion, That all Disputes about this subject might be decided by Scripture; which I do also heartily desire, and close with him therein.

To the seventh Chapter.

The last Chapter saith as little to the proof of the Point, as the former; only now and then names the word *Sabbath*, with some allusions to the Saints eternal rest with Christ: and therefore I pass it over. And in the close of all, he adds a Postscript, wherein I finde only this *memento*, That for the first three hundred yeers after Christ, *Infant baptism*, and the *first day Sabbath*, will hardly be found. He means, I suppose, in Ecclesiastical Histories. And what if they be not found at all? will that be any good argument, either against the one, or for the other? much less will it prove the continuance of the seventh Sabbath. These three last Chapters, and also the first, I would have passd as impertinent to the question; but that some, who are over-much affected with any thing written in favor of that opinion, might have thought they had been purposely omitted, because of some matter of weight therein contained.

Thus have I, according to my slender measure, traced the Author through his whole Discourse, and not omitted any thing willingly, that seems to speak to the Point. And in answering to the Particulars, I have dealt as candidly and mildly as I could, hoping that the Author himself, nor any that are tender and conscientious, will take this, my labour, in ill part, since my aim and scope is to be helpful to them, to shew them their mistakes, and to strengthen such as are wavering and doubtful.

FINIS.



